



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,949	12/28/2001	Thomas L. Fredell	62868.011801	9371
45599	7590	01/27/2006		
GREENBERG TRAUIG LLP MET LIFE BUILDING 200 PARK AVENUE; 14TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10166				
			EXAMINER PERUNGAVOOR, VENKATANARAY	
			ART UNIT 2132	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,949

Applicant(s)

FREDELL, THOMAS L.

Examiner

Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-18, 20-35, 37-41 and 43-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-18, 20-35, 37-41 and 43-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The Applicant's arguments regarding the addition of title "Brief Summary of Invention" is not persuasive. And the Applicant is required to add the title within the specifications see MPEP 608.01(a)[R-3]. And further, the Applicant's has not amended the Abstract as requested from previous office action, thus the objection to the specification stands.
2. The Applicant's argument's regarding the 35 USC § 112 1st ¶ of claims 18 and 41 are not persuasive. As amendment still does not limit the base claim as indicated in the previous office action. In particular, the base claim discloses an singular intermediary server and dependent claim 18 and 41 discloses an plurality of intermediary servers. And further the amendment of claims 18 and 41 is also rejected under 35 USC § 112 2nd ¶ has being indefinite, as the base claim recites transferring login authentication data to one intermediary server, then later the dependent claims recites transferring login authentication data from each of plurality of intermediary servers. Thus the amendment has not sufficiently overcome the 35 USC § 112 1st ¶ & 35 USC § 112 2nd ¶ rejection.
3. And further the applicant's arguments regarding Shambroom(U.S. Patent 5,923,756) not having control access feature using Single Sign On is not persuasive. As Shambroom discloses the control access feature using Single

Sign On to *specific information* see Col 7 Ln 59-64 & Col 8 Ln 27-40 & Col 9 Ln 46-52 and further forming an subset of all information associated with the host server using *login* information see Col 8 Ln 19-26 & Col 8 Ln 41-67 & Col 10 Ln 39-60.

4. The Applicant's arguments regarding Claim 17,23,40 and 46 are not persuasive. And further the applicant's arguments regarding accounting data and configuration file/log file not being the same document as present invention is not persuasive. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), "During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process".
5. The Applicant's arguments regarding Claim 51 and 52 are not persuasive. And is rejected along the same lines as Claim 18 and 40 above.
6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

Claim Objections

7. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not). Misnumbered claim 51 has been renumbered 52.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

8. Claim 18 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the claim is not limiting as Claim 1 and 26, respectively, discloses "...an intermediary server...", which implies a singular intermediary server, however claim 18 discloses "...plurality of intermediary servers...", which implies multiple intermediary server, and hence improper claim form see MPEP 2164.08[R-2].
9. Claims 19-23, and 51 are rejected by the virtue of their dependency on Claim 18.
10. Claims 42-46, and 52 are rejected by the virtue of their dependency on Claim 26.
11. Claim 18 and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention. The use of the term "...a plurality of..." renders the claim indefinite.

12. Claims 19-23, and 51 are rejected by the virtue of their dependency on Claim 18.

13. Claims 42-46, and 52 are rejected by the virtue of their dependency on Claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. Claim 1-12, 14-16, 18, 20-22, 24-39, 41, 43-45, 47-52, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,923,756 to Shambroom.

15. Regarding Claim 1, 26 Shambroom discloses connecting to an network server(intermediary server) from a client processor see Col 6 Ln 21-27; transferring the client login authentication data provided by the intermediary server to host server and granting the user access to information associated with host server when client login authentication data is transferred to the host server see Col 5 Ln 13-35; access to specific information forming an subset of all information associated with the host server is dependent on login authentication data see Col 10 Ln 39-60 and also the arguments above.

16. Regarding Claim 2 and 27, The transferring of client login authentication information, consists of first transferring the client login authentication information to client from intermediary server and then transferring the client login

authentication data to host server from the client is disclosed by Shambroom see Col 5 Ln 36-55.

17. Regarding Claim 3, The client includes a client software program and this program used to transfer the login authentication information from the intermediary device and the client program is used to transfer the login authentication data to the host server is disclosed by Shambroom see Col 5 Ln 10-35.

18. Regarding Claim 4 and 28, Shambroom discloses the use of SSL for connection between client and network server, and the use of Kerberos authentication protocol for connection between network server and the host as well as between client and host see Col 5 Ln 28-35 & Col 7 Ln 14-51 & Col 9 Ln 56-64.

19. Regarding Claim 5 and 29, Shambroom discloses the first web server software program for providing a first website and second server program for providing second website see Col 10 Ln 25-54.

20. Regarding Claim 6, Shambroom discloses the transferring of client authentication information to host server through a intermediary server see Fig. 1 item 300.

21. Regarding Claim 7 and 8, 30 and 31, Shambroom discloses the web browser from the client is used to communicate between client and intermediary server see Col 7 Ln 14-24; and also discloses the communication between intermediary server and host server through an CGI interface see Col 10 Ln 1-15; further discloses the host server having a private key for decrypt which the examiner asserts suggests an program see Col 9 Ln 37-54.
22. Regarding Claim 9, 32, Shambroom discloses a client processor being a computer see Col 1 Ln 21-34.
23. Regarding Claim 10, Shambroom discloses the logging in with user credentials see Col 5 Ln 17-27 & Col 9 Ln 2-14.
24. Regarding Claim 11, Shambroom discloses the comparing of user credential against a list see Col 9 Ln 46-54.
25. Regarding Claim 12, 35, Shambroom discloses the list being an ACL(Access Control List) which control information that is sent to destination server see Col 9 Ln 46-54.

26. Regarding Claim 14 and 15, 20 and 21, 37 and 38, 43 and 44, Shambroom discloses the specific information being a electronic document(contained within the database) see Col 8 Ln 27-40 & Col 4 Ln 22-39.
27. Regarding Claim 16, 22, 39, 45, Shambroom discloses the file includes text data, binary data, still image data, moving image data and audio data see Col 11 Ln 8-14.
28. Regarding Claim 18, 41, Shambroom discloses the number of intermediary devices see Fig. 6A item 700 and item 840.
29. Regarding Claim 24, 47, Shambroom discloses the use of internet see Fig. 3 item 450.
30. Regarding Claim 25, 48, Shambroom discloses the transferring of data in encrypted format see Col 7 Ln 40-51.
31. Claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale as Claim 1 above.
32. Regarding Claim 33, Shambroom discloses the use of password associated with the user and matching of this password see Col 8 Ln 41-50 & Col 9 Ln 46-54.

33. Regarding Claim 49 and 50 are rejected under the same rationale as Claim 1 above.

34. Regarding Claim 51 and 52, Shambroom discloses the logging-in to one of the plurality of intermediary servers from the client processor which intermediary server the client is logged into see Col 9 Ln 15-36.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

35. Claim 17, 23, 40, 46, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,923,756 to Shambroom in view of U.S. Patent 5,898,780 to Liu et al.(hereinafter Liu).

36. Regarding Claim 17, 23, 40, 46, Shambroom does not disclose the reviewing, modifying and deleting of documents. However, Liu discloses the reviewing, modifying and deleting of documents see Col 8 Ln 26-59. It would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in the invention of the reviewing, modifying and deleting of documents in the invention of Shambroom in order to have an updated and current file as taught in Liu see Col. 8 Ln 49-55.

Conclusion


37. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor whose telephone number is 571-272-7213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

39. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Venkatanarayanan Perungavoor
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

VP
1/20/2006


GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100